

UNIVERSITY CONSOLIDATION:

A PLEA FOR

HIGHER EDUCATION

IN ONTARIO.

BY CANADENSIS.

*Reprinted from "Belford's Magazine" for December,
1876.*

WITH EXTENSIVE ADDITIONS.

"Who does not see that, in this country, where...every college makes its own standard...authority lodged in a central institution would become a potent means for the elevation and co-ordination of all our...colleges? Who does not see that the tendency of such a provision would give us eventually a grand national system of education."—Hon. J. W. HOYT, Judge in the Department of Education at the Centennial Exhibition, on an American "National University."

"What is wanted in this country is an example which will stamp into the minds of our people what a true University ought to be."—President WHITE, of Cornell University.

"A real State University I understand to be one managed directly by the State, and not through a close corporation provided for by the State."—President ELIOT, of Harvard University.

Toronto :

PRINTED BY HUNTER, ROSE & CO., 25 WELLINGTON STREET.
1877.

PUBLISHED THIS MONTH.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF LORD MACAULAY. By his nephew
G. OTTO TREVELYAN. Two volumes. Crown 8vo., \$3.00; half
calf, \$5.00; full Morocco, \$8.00.

THE HOME COOK BOOK. By TORONTO LADIES. Published for
the benefit of the Hospital for Sick Children. Cloth, \$1.50.

THE PEARL FOUNTAIN and other Fairy Tales. By BRIDGET
and JULIA KAVANAGH with 30 illustrations, by J. Moyr Smith. Cloth,
\$1.50.

FOOTSTEPS OF THE MASTER. By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE,
author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," "We and Our Neighbours," &c.
Cloth, \$1.25.

A MAD WORLD. By AN AMATEUR LUNATIC (Julius Chambers).
Cloth, \$1.00, paper, 75c.

MADCAP VIOLET. By WM. BLACK, author of "Three Feathers,"
"A Princess of Thule," etc. Cloth, \$1.25, paper, 75c.

TEN YEARS OF MY LIFE. By PRINCESS FELIX SALM-SALM. Cloth.
\$1.00, paper, 75c.

THE DETECTIVE AND THE SOMNAMBULIST. By ALLAN
PINCHERTON, author of "The Expressman and Detective," etc. Cloth,
\$1.00, paper, 75c.

THE BASTONNAIS. By JOHN LESPERANCE. Cloth, \$1.00, paper,
75 cts.

For Sale by all Booksellers, or mailed post-paid on receipt
of price, by

BELFORD BROS.,

PUBLISHERS,

TORONTO.

UNIVERSITY CONSOLIDATION:

A PLEA FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN ONTARIO.

BY CANADENSIS.

*Reprinted from "Belford's Magazine" for December,
1876.*

WITH EXTENSIVE ADDITIONS.

"Who does not see that, in this country, where....every college makes its own standard....authority lodged in a central institution would become a potent means for the elevation and co-ordination of all our....colleges? Who does not see that the tendency of such a provision would give us eventually a grand national system of education."—Hon. J. W. HORT, Judge in the Department of Education at the Centennial Exhibition, on an American "National University."

"What is wanted in this country is an example which will stamp into the minds of our people what a true University ought to be."—President WHITE, of Cornell University.

"A real State University I understand to be one managed directly by the State, and not through a close corporation provided for by the State."—President ELIOT, of Harvard University.

Toronto :

PRINTED BY HUNTER, ROSE & CO., 25 WELLINGTON STREET.
1877.

RECEIVED
JAN 18 1968

PREFATORY NOTE.

The following paper discusses the desirability of some change being made in our present university system, so as to make it more thoroughly national in its character and working.

The question has been often mooted, but as yet with no practical result. It involves "money." It is also said to touch upon "denominationalism," or rather "sectarianism" (a more distasteful term), as well as various other delicate and difficult matters which even politicians cannot touch without harm, and hence the subject is let alone. "*Laissez faire*" is felt to be the only safe policy. And yet the conviction is clear in the minds of many thinking men, that our present system is unsatisfactory and anomalous; that it is of a hybrid type, and in its present shape is not capable of producing the satisfactory national results, in the interest of higher education, which it ought to do, and which every well-wisher of his country so earnestly desires.

The State pays handsomely for its share of the expenses of primary and secondary education; but it pays only a comparative sum for the entire university work done in the country, and yet it only performs not one-half of that work itself.

This seems scarcely fair; and, for a rich and high-spirited Province like Ontario, is scarcely compatible with its dignity and obligations. This partial pecuniary interest, in university education, for which it only pays a part of its share, paralyzes its hand, and no doubt prevents it from making any comprehensive effort to raise the character of the whole university work done, or of supervising it as it should. No doubt it is hard to deal with a question beset with so many and grave difficulties. But that should not deter patriotic men from looking at the future of this great

question, and giving it their best and most earnest consideration.

There are a few suggestive facts referred to in the following pages, based on the experience of our American neighbours, which are worthy of our best consideration :—

1. The first is that, even with the great multiplication of American Colleges, “ the number of students seeking a college education ” in that country has relatively declined for some years.

2. The second is that the relative number of college or university men in public life has steadily declined since the days of the American revolution.

3. That but comparatively few college or university men are guilty of acts of corruption, unfortunately so characteristic of political life in the United States and elsewhere.

4. That religious parents will not, as a rule, send their children to a college in the discipline and oversight of which they have not confidence—no matter how richly endowed, or prosperous, the college may be.

These are facts to which our public and university men should give due weight, in considering and settling the question of higher education in Ontario.

To aid in the settlement of this question, the writer has endeavoured to discuss and illustrate the following points in these pages, which he has thus summarized :—

The General Question of Universities in Europe and America—Opinions of Prof. Andrews, Dr. Newman, and Mr. Gathorne Hardy on Colleges and Universities—“ The Standards of Harvard and Yale ” Explained—Early Colonial Policy—Abandonment of it, and Results—Degeneracy of the Modern System—Undue Multiplication of “ Degree-giving ” Colleges—Rev. Dr. McCosh, of Princeton, and President White, of Cornell University, on Consolidation—Evil of the present system felt in the United States—Efforts to Remedy it—Scheme of Reform—Revival of the Washington—Madison—J. Q. Adams’ Plan of an American National

University at Washington—Opinions of President Eliot, of Harvard, and President White, of Cornell, on the Scheme—Legitimate Influence of such a University—Supineness of our University Men—"Dignified Neutrality" in Canada and England—Proceedings at Convocation characterized—Comparative Value of University Degrees in Ontario—Criticism on Colleges appointing their own Professors as Examiners—How the System Works—Classification of Colleges as represented by the Head Masters of High Schools—Intermediate Examinations—Their Effect—Policy of Extinguishing the Outlying Colleges illustrated—Recent University Reforms or "Innovations" in England and the United States—Mode of dealing with Scholarships in England and Ontario—Original plan of one College and University for the Province—Recent policy of the Legislature—No Data for dealing with the Question.—Practicable Scheme of uniform University Examination—Teaching Colleges need not be of equal Scholastic Rank—One Degree-giving Institution preferred to half-a-dozen—Three ways of effecting University Consolidation—Power of the Legislature in University matters—The Logic of Facts in the Practice of Parents—Conclusion.

UNIVERSITY CONSOLIDATION

IN ONTARIO.

The great difference between the University Systems of Europe and America is the tendency in the one, as in England, to a common centre, and, as in Germany, to a common standard, and in the other to various centres and different standards. In England, university life centres chiefly in Oxford and Cambridge—both, somewhat under competitive influences, aiming at a common standard of high excellence. In Germany, each of the universities is designed to furnish instruction of the highest order in every branch.* In the United States, on the other hand—after the modern, or post-revolution example, of which our university system seems to have been unfortunately modelled—the “universities” have many standards—all professedly acknowledging, if not adopting, the standards of Harvard and Yale. Following, however, a universal law of animal life, the farther each of these “universities” is from the acknowledged centre and spring, or heart of university life, the weaker are its pulsations, and the lower are the standards of excellence which they each adopt and

* This is the University ideal of Prof. Andrews, President of the British Association, who says: “A University, or *Studium Generale*, ought to embrace in its arrangements the whole circle of studies which involve the material interests of society, as well as those which cultivate intellectual refinement.”—*Address at meeting in Glasgow, Sept. 6.*

The difference between the German and English College systems is thus pointed out by Rev. Prof. Seeley in his *Liberal Education in Universities*: “In the German Universities the whole field of knowledge is elaborately divided and assigned in lots to different lecturers. . . . At Cambridge scarcely anything but classics and mathematics is lectured on in the colleges at all, and at every college the lectures are substantially the same.”—Page 150.

Dr. Newman in his *Office and Work of Universities* distinguishes the University and College thus:—“The University is for the world, and the College is for the nation.

. . . The University is for the philosophical discourse, the eloquent sermon, or the well contested disputation; and the College for the catechetical lecture.”—Pages 344-5. Mr. Gathorn Hardy, in discussing the Oxford University Bill last June, also speaks of the professional teaching of the university as having the advantage of giving a large and general view of great subjects, though it could not, he thought, impress special parts of subjects on the minds of pupils as well as the individual (i. e. tutorial) teaching of colleges did. This point is more fully elaborated in discussing the American prospect of a “National University,” in another part of this paper.

follow. The natural consequence of the two systems is, that in England, a high standard is constantly maintained; while in the United States, the tendency, until latterly, has been the other way, towards diffusiveness in the curriculum, and haste and superficiality in the mode of teaching the subjects of the course.* Another evil, traceable to the scantiness of "foundation," which has crept into ambitious "universities," is, for their managers, either to prescribe a so-called "eclectic" course of special subjects, or an "omnibus" one which (on paper) shall be extensive enough to satisfy the most fastidious scholar, but which, nevertheless, includes a long list of "honorary" subjects which, it is well understood, shall bide their time until the stern hand of poverty shall relax its hold on the "university."†

When we speak of the "standards of Harvard and Yale," as the highest American ideal of superiority in a university, it should not be understood that we regard them as the only universities of real merit in the United States. This, it is true, is the popular idea,—regarding them as representative institutions, and in this sense we use the expression, but it is not by any means correct—as recent university movements and reforms in the United States show. Most of the old colonial foundations, including Harvard and Yale, which now exist, still maintain a high standard of their order, quite above the average modern American college, but that the standard has been lowered is admitted by more than one recent American writer. Mr. Ten Brook, in his *American State Universities*, says:—

"Most of the colonies established or aided (the colleges which they founded). The principle of State support to higher learning was not merely accepted, but was the prevalent one. A period of decline, however, in the desire, and perhaps in the means of culture, followed Intercourse with the mother country was for a time cut off; resources were diminished; the spirit of

* "An American Graduate," in the *International Review* for May-June, 1876, draws a graphic picture of the mode of teaching in American "universities" as compared with that in the universities of Germany. He says "the American community in general little knows how bad the teaching in our higher schools (universities) is."—Page 291. American educationalists of late years have shown to effect a university "reform," in this particular as in others.

† The N. Y. *Nation* of Sept. 28th, in discussing this question says:—"The great source of the weakness of small colleges now lies in the fancy of founders, or boards of trustees, that the more ground a college curriculum covers, or tries to cover, the more of a college it is."

intellectual progress was depressed in the toils and privations of pioneer life From these causes there had arisen, or was arising, a comparative apathy, which continued for a generation to increase.”—Pages 17, 18.

This continued degeneracy from colonial times is still further illustrated by another writer in the *North American Review*, for October, 1875. His remarks are significant and full of warning to those among us who either uphold the American College multiplying system, which we have unfortunately adopted, or knowing evils of our present pernicious system, take no steps to prevent its continuance. The writer says:—

“We have no doubt that the immense number of our colleges is very generally deplored. But we are not sure that the public is ready to admit either the extent of the evil, or the fact that the evil is the legitimate and necessary product of our system. . . We believe that as soon as it was determined that the colleges and universities were not to be supported in the same manner as the lower schools are supported, * it was fixed as a necessary consequence that while the lower schools would flourish, the colleges and universities would multiply beyond all demand, and a vast majority of them would languish beyond all recovery. We believe that under [this] change of policy, † . . the importance of higher education has declined in public estimation; that, while a comparison of the state of the learned professions at the present time with the same of fifty years ago will reveal a degeneracy, a careful study of statistics prepared by President Barnard [of Columbia College, New York] in 1870, will show that the number of students seeking a college education has relatively declined.‡

* The writer, on this point says:—“During the whole of our colonial history, the support of the public treasury was comprehensively bestowed alike upon the colleges and the lower schools.”—Pages 386, 387. Again:—“The state had formerly supported generally both the higher schools and the lower; now, it retained control of the lower, while it substantially abandoned all interest in the colleges and universities.”—Page 387.

† The same writer says:—“The most immediate result of this abandonment of the early policy of the country was an enormous increase in the number of colleges.”—Page 387.

‡ President Barnard’s table is as follows:—

United States.	1840.	1860	1869.
Population.....	14,582,029	27,490,266	36,000,000
Students.....	9,416	13,661	14,141
Ratio.....	1.1,549	1.2,012	1.2,546

"We believe that nothing but a return to the early [colonial] policy of our country [as to State aid "comprehensively bestowed"] will reinstate the general cause of higher education in the position of relative importance which it formerly occupied."—Pages 373, 374.

Thus we see that the modern American university system, in its relation of the colonial university idea, has been largely a failure—so far in many cases, as thorough and accurate scholarship is concerned. It may have done good, however, as a pioneer system, which, so to speak, hoisted the standard of education, as the colonist plants the flag of advancing civilization in many a spot which would otherwise have no opportunity of tasting, much less of drinking deep, of the Pierian spring. Such a system may do for a new country and a young community; but it is not adapted to, nor should it be deliberately chosen, as it appears to have been, by a Province so old and so educationally conservative as Ontario.

The Germany university system with its provision for "learned leisure" on the part of the professors, and which is so well adapted to promote research, has been much discussed of late years in England. The preponderance of feeling there is still, however, in favour of "teaching colleges," rather than of universities for research. The promoters of the Oxford University Bill of last summer, while providing greater facilities for scientific research than before existed, deprecated any vital departure from the English system of teaching colleges in favour of the German university idea of research.

In the United States, as we shall show in another part of this paper, there is a strong feeling in favour of the German ideal of a university. As to the characteristics of the modern college and university of the United States, which we seem to have copied in Ontario, we shall quote an impartial witness. Mr. Gilman, in the *North American Review* for January, 1876, says:

"Soon after the revolution was over new colleges were projected. . . . They were kindred in organization and plan, imperfectly endowed, abounding in aspirations, sustained by sacrifice, and restricted in scope. Instead of maintaining *one strong* [degree-giving] *Institution in each state*, . . . the friends of education entered upon a rivalry which in some states was fatal and in some injurious, to the cause they advocated. . . . In 1873, General Eaton, the United States Commissioner of Education

reported the names of . . . 545 [arts, law and medicine] degree-giving institutions within the United States. Most of these colleges are inadequately endowed; . . . thus we see that to-day the three colleges of 1700, the nine colleges of [before] 1776 . . . have multiplied far beyond all expectation . . . If these numerous colleges had been called academies, or high schools, or collegiate seminaries, or gymnasia, every body at home and abroad would have applauded their organization . . . but because they are called by the same name as Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Columbia, . . . they appear to disadvantage by comparison; and it is not uncommon to hear them spoken of in terms of collective depreciation. But it should be borne in mind that they would not have been called into being except by the magic name of "colleges," which suggests to the enlightened American an idea inherited from colonial times for which he will contribute labour, time, thought and money."—Pages 216-218.

The Americans themselves are beginning to feel the burthen of the multiplication of "degree-giving" colleges in the United States. The writer in the *North American Review*, which we have quoted strongly deprecates it, and quotes the opinions of advocates of his views, as follows:—

"Rev. Dr. McCosh, in his inaugural address at Princeton, proposed that the colleges of each State should be associated in one university, somewhat after the form of Queen's University in Ireland, and this proposal is favoured by others; but no measures have been taken looking in that direction.*

"President White, of Cornell University, . . . urges as a remedy for the present distracted state of higher education, that in the older States public and private aid should be concentrated upon a small number of the broadest and strongest foundations already laid," etc.—Page 219.

* The remarks made by Rev. Dr. McCosh, in his inaugural, were as follows:—

"I have sometimes thought that as Oxford University combines some twenty-two colleges, and Cambridge eighteen, so there might in this country be a combination of colleges in one university. Let each State have one University to unite all its colleges, and appointing examiners, and bestowing of considerable pecuniary value on more deserving students. Some such a combination as this, while it would promote a wholesome rivalry among the colleges, would, at the same time, keep up the standard of erudition. Another benefit would arise: the examination of the candidates being conducted, not by those who taught them, but by elected examiners, would give a high and catholic tone to the teaching in the colleges. I throw out the idea, that thinking men may ponder it."

Among university men in the United States, the evil of so many "degree-giving" institutions, has been severely felt. In 1871 and 1872, the question "of the value of College Degrees," was discussed in a report, and orally at the American National Education Association. The following "outline of a scheme" of university reform was presented by the Committee in 1872. It shows how strongly the Americans feel the necessity of some "reform" in the system of degree-giving in the United States.

1. "Let each State organize a University Senate composed of a definite number of members, selected from among the oldest and most scholarly of its citizens. In this body, each college and university should be represented.

2. "This Senate should have the power, and it should be its duty :—

a. "To prescribe the qualifications for each degree conferred by the institutions represented at it.

b. "To enact the statutes regulating all examinations for degrees.

c. "To conduct, in accordance with these statutes, all such examinations by examiners of its own appointment.

NOTE.—"These examinations could be conducted by printed papers, either at the seat of each institution of instruction, or at some convenient place where all of the candidates could be convened.

d. "To pass [judgment] on the qualifications of candidates.

e. "To certify the result to the colleges, and countersign their diplomas.

NOTE.—"Other powers might be vested in the Senate by the Legislature.

3. "The degrees should be conferred by each college or university on its own commencement-day, and the usual diploma given, which should bear the seal both of the institution of instruction conferring the degree and of the university senate, and be signed by the officers of both.

4. "The entire expense of this senate, and of conducting these examinations, should be borne by the state.

5. "The consent of the university senate should be required, in order that any college or university might confer an honorary degree. For all such degrees the necessary qualifications should

be prescribed definitely, and they should be conferred upon no man destitute of them.

6. "This senate should have power to distinguish those who are entitled to special honors, and to establish scholarships and fellowships for the encouragement of the worthy."—Proceedings, pages 227, 228.

This latter suggestion is a good and practical one. There is no reason why (if a "university consolidation" should take place in Ontario) the Legislature should not authorize the establishment of "scholarships and fellowships for the encouragement of the worthy." Under no circumstances, however, is it desirable that the sum necessary to do so be taken out of the Toronto university endowment. It should be voted direct by the Legislature as an encouragement to higher education as tested by a uniform and provincial standard, as in the case of high schools.

Another plan for giving a higher eminence to university culture, which has received a good deal of attention from American educationists, is the revival of Washington's project (when President) of a "national university at the capital of the Republic." Washington himself, by will, left \$30,000 towards founding the university; and President Madison, in 1810, and J. Q. Adams, in 1825, both recommended Washington's scheme to the favourable consideration of Congress. In 1870 the charter of the law college of the proposed national university was granted, and in 1872, President Grant, as first Chancellor, conferred degrees on thirty-one candidates. In the same year the plan was elaborately brought forward in two Bills, which were introduced into the United States Senate. One of these Bills, after careful consideration by a Committee, was unanimously reported to the House and its passage recommended.

President Eliot, of Harvard University, who was unfavourable to the scheme, chiefly on political grounds, described the bills as "tentative plans for creating a crowning university, richer, better, and more comprehensive than any existing institution, and under the patronage of the general Government."

The approved bill submitted to Congress proposes the establishment of ten faculties in the university, and an endowment of twenty millions of dollars, yielding an annual revenue for the purposes of the university, of one million of dollars.

The promoters of this great national university, in which is an embodiment of the German idea, propose, in regard to it,—

“1. That it should be broad enough to embrace every department of science, literature, and the arts, and every real profession.

“2. That it should be high enough to supplement the highest existing institutions of the country, and to embrace within its field of instruction the utmost limits of human knowledge.

“3. That in the interest of truth and justice, it should guarantee equal privileges to all duly qualified applicants for admission to its courses of instruction, and equal rights and the largest freedom to all earnest investigators in that domain which lies outside the limits of acknowledged science.

“4. That it should be so constituted and established as to command the hearty support of the American people, regardless of section, party, or creed.”

“5. That its material resources should be vast enough to enable it not only to furnish—and that either freely or at nominal cost—the best instruction the world can afford, but also to provide the best known facilities for the work of scientific investigation, together with endowed fellowships and honorary fellowships, open respectively to the most meritorious graduates and to such investigators, whether native or foreign, as, being candidates therefor, shall have distinguished themselves most in the advancement of knowledge.

“6. That it should be so co-ordinated in plan with the other institutions of the country, as not only in no way to conflict with them, but, on the contrary, to become at once a potent agency for their improvement, and the means of creating a complete, harmonious and efficient system of American education.”

The necessity for a truly National University, on this broad and comprehensive basis, is thus set forth by President White of Cornell University :—

“Look the whole number of our colleges through, and you do not find, save in one or two, any regular provision for instruction in political economy and social science. Take the plainest results as to social science. Every year the cost is fearful. Nearly forty State Legislatures, and nearly forty times forty County and Local Boards dealing with matters relating to pauperism, crime, lunacy, idiocy, the care of the deaf, dumb and blind, making provision re

garding them at a cost of millions upon millions, and very rarely with any fundamental study of the complicated questions involved. Yonder is England suffering from errors in these respects, made centuries ago. Here are our States repeating many of the same errors.

"Take next the simplest results as regards political science. Look at our National Legislature, containing always a large number of strong men, and patriotic men—but the strongest of them often given up to theories, which the most careful thinking of the world, and the world's experience, as recorded in history, long since exploded.

"But the analogy extends beyond the internal affairs of our Nation and States; it extends to our external relations. I do not speak of the diplomatic service, though the want of higher knowledge with reference to that, has long been felt; but I refer to an analogy of another sort forced upon us in these times. The warfare to which men are educated at West Point and Annapolis, is not the only warfare between modern States. The greatest modern warfare is rapidly becoming an industrial warfare. Every great nation is recognizing this. And this warfare is as real as the other. Not only does a true regard for the material prosperity of the nation, demand a more regular and thorough provision for advanced education, but our highest political interests demand it. From all sides come outcries against the debasement of American politics, and especially against gross material corruption. This gives much food for serious thought.

"Now I assert that, as a rule, our public men who have received an advanced education, have not yielded to gross corruption. Understand the assertion. It is not that men who have not had the advantage of an advanced education, yield generally to corruption,—far from it. Some of the noblest opponents of corruption we have had, have been men debarred by early poverty from thorough education. But what I assert is simply this. Go among the men who disgrace our country by gross corruption,—whether in City, State, or National Council,—and you find the great majority of them of the class that has received just education enough to enter into the struggle for place or pelf, and not enough to appreciate higher considerations.

"The struggle for place or pelf (by a man) of higher education,

whether in science, literature, or history, is, as a rule, modified by considerations to which a man of lower education is very often a stranger. He is lifted up to a place from which he can look down upon success in corruption with the scorn it deserves.

"The letting down in character of our National and State Councils has notoriously increased, just as the predominance of men of advanced education in these Councils has decreased. President Barnard's admirable paper (referred to on page 9), showing the relatively diminishing number of men of advanced education in our public stations—decade by decade,—marks no less the rise—decade by decade,—of material corruption. . . . There is a relation here of cause and effect."

We give these extracts, not with a view of suggesting the adoption of any scheme so broad and comprehensive as the one here explained, and the necessity for it enforced. Our object is rather to show what efforts the leading educationists of the United States are making to retrieve their educational position, and to place university culture on a higher level than ever, far above a modest scheme of "university consolidation" such as we advocate. We have also another object in view, and that is to show, *per contra*, that, while the Americans are anxiously alive to the importance of this question, as it affects their educational future, yet how little, I may say nothing, we are doing in Ontario to place the system of university education upon a national basis, so that its standard must rise, and cannot be lowered at the pleasure of collegiate corporations, which may spring into existence at any moment, *ad infinitum*, as we have seen.

A further reason influences us in giving these extracts. Every word uttered in them is true, and no less true as applied to the United States than they are as applied to Canada. They contain significant, and even solemn words of counsel and warning, which it is not wise in us to ignore. Some day we too must look the same "social" and "industrial" problems in the face as stern facts, and must seek to solve them also. For the present we may be content to take our experience second-hand; but we would be unworthy of the great future which we trust is before us, if we should not even now so shape our educational plans that we shall not hereafter have to waste precious time in useless regrets, as our American neighbours are now doing.

As Canadians, another consideration should influence us. The

high educational position which Ontario confessedly took at the recent International Exhibition, involves, if not a pledge, at least an obligation that we must not stand still. Recent High School movements of the Minister of Education in an upward direction, should be a hint to university men, to whom the country looks, that their *laissez faire* policy is unjust to the great interests in their hands. They should see to it, as their American brethren are doing, that our university system is placed on a solid, if not "consolidated" basis. Nor should we, as the leading educating Province in the Dominion, ignore the educational problems which are being discussed and worked out, with more or less success, by our neighbours. They see the evil, and seek to remove or remedy it. We see the evil, but let it not be said that we do nothing.

Some of the remarks of other American writers on a National University scheme, are so pertinent to this portion of our subject that we should like to quote them. We have only room, however, for those of the author of the Bill, of which the Upper House of Congress approved. The Hon. J. W. Hoyt, (Chairman of the American Education Judges at the late Centennial,) in closing his remarks on the National University Bill, used words which should have a meaning and significance for us. He says:—

"The logic of party and reason will not permit [the United States Government] to stop short of *the most complete provision for every department of American Education*. . . . The variety and vastness of the national resources, and the rapid progress of other nations, are making a strong and growing demand upon the industrial arts, which they are powerless to meet without the help of the best technical schools; while the conspicuous place we of necessity hold among the great nations of the earth, the nature of our Government, and the genius and aspirations of our people, are reasons deep and urgent for a high and thorough culture, that must early move the nation to adopt measures that will give to the United States a true University."

With such an educational programme before our Republican neighbours, can we, as their monarchical rivals and immediate and intimate neighbours, sit still and fold our hands and care nothing for our higher educational future? We trust not.

There is one fact in connection with this matter of University Consolidation in Ontario to which we have only incidentally referred, and which to thoughtful men would appear inexplicable

were not the causes producing it well known. Everyone whose opinions on university matters are of any value has long since come to the conclusion that one university—a real university—with as many teaching colleges in connection with it as can be established—is amply sufficient for Ontario for years to come;* and yet not one of our public men or university scholars has made an earnest suggestion, or taken any real practical steps towards the accomplishment of such a purpose—the consolidation of our present university system. Desultory remarks have now and then been made on the subject by individuals; and newspapers have sometimes referred hesitatingly to it, not having thought it desirable seriously to discuss the question on its merits as one of national importance; but it is singular that, since the close of the last university contest in 1860, no steps have been taken to remedy a professed evil, which at the time both sides feared would result from the multiplication of universities in the Province. Indeed, as a matter of fact, the so-called evil has been allowed to grow and develop itself to a large extent; so that, instead of *four* universities, as at that time, we have now *seven* chartered with full university powers. While this unusual extension was taking place, university men, who should have made their voice heard, stood aloof and allowed the matter to go by default. But unfortunately university men in Ontario have rarely, if ever, acted in concert. They have either been in antagonism to one another, or chosen to maintain the position of “dignified neutrality,” rather than, in the common interest of higher education to have protested against the unwise multiplication of not very strongly equipped universities in the Province. Merely to have protested against the erection of colleges into “universities,” would have savoured of querulous exclusiveness; it was, nevertheless, a grand opportunity lost for uniting to place our university system on a firm and comprehensive footing. Thus, the cause of higher education has suffered, because university men, who ought

* As illustrative of this point, the *North American Review* for October, 1875, says :—
 “The advantages of a concentration of energies for higher education have long been felt in every nation in Europe. England, Ireland and Scotland, with a population not much less than our own, have scarcely half a score of institutions empowered to grant degrees. In France there is, strictly speaking, but a single one. In Germany, where the system of education has been brought to the highest perfection, the number is only twenty-one, or one for about two millions of inhabitants. In our own country the latest announcement is that we have 322 colleges and universities, each entitled to rank itself as one of our highest institutions of learning.”—Page 372.

to have been its champions and guardians, chose to *fact* upon the *laissez faire* principle rather than from the nobler impulse of patriotic motives. This apathetic state of feeling which seems chronic, is, we fear, unfortunate for the university future of Ontario. By persisting in such an exploded Japanese system of non-intercourse, (a system which the Japanese themselves have nobly repudiated, and especially in education,) we are inflicting an evil upon our country and doing an injury to its higher scholarship.

It may be alleged that there is little or no intercourse among rival university men even in England. But this is not substantially true. As university men seeking a common end they may have occasion for but little intercourse; nevertheless, in the endless literary, scientific, educational and religious discussions, writings and meetings which take place constantly, within the small area of the three kingdoms, they are perpetually brought into close contact. In this country, beyond a local "institute," or religious meeting, or other gathering, they have little or no personal or literary intercourse, and seek none. This is greatly to be deprecated; for it tends (perhaps unconsciously) to foster a certain amount of local university pride and exclusiveness.

Professor Andrews, President of the British Association, in his inaugural speech at Glasgow on the 6th September, refers to a feature of university isolation, which also prevails in Canada, and strongly recommends an abandonment of English exclusiveness as it is evinced towards the Scottish universities. He says: "The Universities ought to admit freely to university positions, men of high repute from other universities. Not less important would it be for the encouragement of learning throughout the country that the English universities should be prepared to recognize the ancient universities of Scotland as freely as they have always recognized the Elizabethan University of Dublin. Such a measure would invigorate the whole university system of the country more than any other I can think of. As an indirect result professors would be promoted from smaller positions in one university to higher positions in another, after they had given proofs of industry and ability; and stagnation, hurtful alike to professional men and professional life, would be effectually prevented."

Another phase of university life (if "life" it can be called), we desire to notice. At some of the universities the annual gather-

ings at "Convocations," or "Commencement," (to borrow an American word sometimes in use,) which might be made really enjoyable as a university gala day, as in some countries, is suffered to be barely tolerable, if not a positive infliction, by reason of its dry stiffness and formality. Such a "crowning day" to the graduates is observed in so solemn and formal a manner that, under the benumbing influence, the student at the close of his successful college career might feel as though he were about to be led to execution rather than as the recipient of the highest honour or gift which his university could bestow. All this indicates the absence of judgment and tact in not making an important official yet social university gathering a pleasant one for all parties concerned. It tends to repress that spirit of enthusiasm with which young men naturally do, and should, enter on the real business of life. Not that we would seek to introduce into Canada the boisterous, yet playful, rudeness of English university convocations, which of late years has had to be checked; but we think that if a little less time were devoted to the wholesale and stereotyped eulogies on particular students which kind-hearted professors generally indulge in, and a little more given to the utterance of short popular addresses by two or three leading public or university men, selected beforehand, it would add greatly to the interest and pleasure of these annual university gatherings, and give them a practical character and value which they do not now possess. To old graduates, and certainly to the general public, the present mode of conducting convocations is insufferable from its sameness and tameness.

It is not our purpose here to discuss the actual or comparative value of the academic degrees which issue from seven (in reality five) universities in Ontario. Such a task would be invidious in the extreme, and productive of no good. It must, however, be patent to every man, competent to judge in such matters, that these degrees are not, and cannot, under the existing system, be of equal value.* Indeed, it is almost impossible for us to estimate their

* The editor of the *Queen's College Journal*, in reply to this portion of our paper says: "Does it occur to *Canadensis* that there may be as much, nay more difference between the value of two degrees from the same university as there may be between two degrees, one from the university that he considers best and the other from the one which he considers furthest from it in point of efficiency." What the editor says may be true in exceptional cases; but it is not true as a rule and, therefore, we cannot admit the validity of the argument based upon it. There is one security which we would have under a

intrinsic, much less their comparative, value as evidences of scholarship, since every university has its own standard, its own examiners, and its own course of instruction. * We would, therefore, have to reconcile three differing, if not antagonistic, elements of university training and examination before we could reach a common ground, or basis, on which, or from which, to estimate the academic value of the degrees granted by our five or seven universities. What enhances the evil of such a manifest diversity of university standards for degrees is the fact, that by law we authorize every one of these universities to fix the standard of

consolidated university system which we do not and, as we have shown, we cannot possess under the present system. All of the degrees granted under the system which we advocate would at least possess a fixed minimum value. The variation would be above that standard and not below it, as very likely is the case under the present system.

* Referring to the system of each college appointing its own professors as examiners, Mr. Lowe, in his speech on the Oxford University Bill, last June, says: "Since the time of the Reformation and the dawning of learning, the office of the University had been limited very much to examining, and very badly it examined, because it selected as its examiners persons who were also tutors, and who were interested, therefore, in the passing of their pupils."

Rev. Dr. Newman, in his "*Office and Work of Universities*," shows that things were at one time even worse at Oxford than Mr. Lowe's statement would indicate. He says: "At the beginning of this century, when things were at the worst at Oxford, some zealous persons attempted to bring the University to bear upon the colleges. The degrees were at that time taken upon no *bona fide* examination. The youth who had passed his three or four years at the place, and wished to graduate, chose his examiners, and invited them to dinner!" . . . It "is notorious that for thirty years one college, by virtue of ancient rights, was able to stand out against the University, and demanded and obtained degrees for its junior members without examination."—Pages 356, 357.

It is only quite recently that the University of Gottingen renounced the right of conferring doctor's degrees without oral examination. We have discussed the practicability of university uniform examination on page 31 of this pamphlet.

The working of this system of examination by the professors themselves is thus truthfully pointed out in a "Report on College Degrees," presented by President Wallace to the American National Education Association in 1872:—

"We have in the United States hundreds of colleges and universities authorized to confer degrees. . . The professors themselves are commonly the examiners. . . The faculty of each college passes on the qualifications of its own candidates. Those familiar with the practical workings of the present system know that it is very difficult to make examinations as severe as they ought to be; very difficult to prevent unworthy candidates from receiving the degrees, which they desire. An accommodating system that passes every one that *goes over* the prescribed course, and regards no one who presents any colour of valid claim as much the easiest of administration. . . Every professor commonly becomes attached to his students. His sympathy with them is and ought to be, that of a father or elder brother. He consequently overlooks their failings and magnifies their excellences, honestly over-estimates them. Many times gentleness of conduct, or high-toned morality is regarded as a compensation for lack of scholarship. Hence professors admit to a degree candidates whom impartial examiners would have unhesitatingly rejected."

qualification of all the head masters of our high schools and collegiate institutes. The possession of a degree from any one of the seven universities in Ontario, or from any university in the British dominions, (with the addition of some slight experience in teaching), entitles the holder to become the head master of any of our high schools and collegiate institutes, without further examination.

In other words: we have made the seven universities in Ontario important factors in our system of public instruction, and yet we have taken no steps to see that a common standard of excellence and culture is maintained in these universities, or that the qualifications of these head masters shall be of an uniform, or even of a fixed minimum, value. * The Legislature has, however, got rid of the difficulty by recognizing these degrees *en bloc*, and giving to each of them an intrinsic and legal value. We do not for a moment mean to say that a high standard of scholarship has not been reached by the head masters of our various high schools and collegiate institutes, who are graduates of the universities in question; but what we do maintain is, that, under our present university system, there is no guarantee, except a moral one, that the evil to which we refer may not and does not exist.

It may be interesting just here to note the number of graduates of the various Canadian and other universities which, under the present system, have furnished the head masters of our high schools and collegiate institutes.

From official returns we derive the following information:—

HIGH SCHOOL MASTERS FROM CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES.

Toronto O., University has furnished	39	Head Masters.
Victoria, O., " " "	14	" "
Queen's, O., " " "	10	" "
Trinity, O., " " "	8	" "
Albert, O., " " "	4	" "
McGill, O., " " "	3	" "
Bishop's, Q., " " "	1	" "
Acadia, N.S., " " "	1	" "
Total	80	

*The editor of the *Queen's College Journal* says, in respect to our remark:—"Now, we cannot see any reason why the attainments of the old masters should be uniform One may confine himself to classics, another to mathematics, etc."

In the first place we may say that the law requires so far a uniformity in the qualifications of head masters that they must be graduates in Arts. They must also, in ad-

HEAD MASTERS FROM VARIOUS OTHER SOURCES.

Trinity (Dublin,) has furnished.....	5	Head Masters.
Marischal (Aber.,) "	4	" "
Queens's (Ireland,) "	1	" "
Cambridge (Eng.) "	1	" "
Wesleyan (Conn., U.S.) "	1	" "
Giessen (Germany,) "	1	" "
Provincial Certificates. "	7	" "
Grand Total.....	100	

The July intermediate examinations at the high schools and collegiate institutes, has also furnished some valuable information, which has been published in the papers, and from which we gather the following interesting facts as to the status of the schools and institutes taught by the graduates of the various recognized universities.

Status of First Class	6 (collegiate institutes)
" Second "	14 (2 collegiate institutes, 12 high schools.)
" Third "	21 (1 " " 20 " ")
" Fourth "	25 (high schools.)
" Fifth "	34 (" ")
Total.....	100

The colleges represented at the same examination by the masters of the first-class collegiate institute, as above, we learn, are as follows:—

Toronto, O.....	2	Head Masters.
Victoria, O.....	2	" "
McGill, Q.....	1	" "
Queens's (Ireland).....	1	" "
Total.....	6	

The colleges represented by the masters of the second-class institutes and high schools are as follows:—

dition, possess a practical knowledge of the science and art of teaching, to the satisfaction of the Minister of Education. Secondly, we had reference solely to the uniformity required by the statute as "Graduate in Arts," and not to the personal tastes or specialities of individual teachers.

Toronto, O.....	7	Head Masters.
Victoria, O.....	2	" "
Trinity, O.	1	" "
Acadia, N.S.....	1	" "
Wesleyan, U.S. (Victoria ad eundem)	1	" "
Trinity, Dublin...	1	" "
Provincial Certificate.....	1	" "

Total..... 14

The December intermediate examinations alters but little, the college representation as given above. From the published statements we learn the following :—

Status of First Class 6 (collegiate institutes.)

"	Second	"	13	high schools.
"	Third	"	4	" "
"	Fourth	"	16	" "
"	Fifth	"	4	" "
"	Sixth	"	4	" "
"	Seventh	"	27	" "
"	Eighth	"	26	" "

100

The colleges represented by the masters of the first-class collegiate institutes, at the December examination, are as follows :—

Toronto, O... ..	2	Head Masters.
Victoria, O.....	2	" "
McGill, Q.....	1	" "
Queen's (Ireland).....	1	" "

6

The colleges represented by the masters of the second-class high schools, at the same examination, are as follows :—

Toronto, O.....	8	Head Masters.
Victoria, O.....	2	" "
Wesleyan, U. S., Victoria ad eundem . .	1	" "
Trinity, Dublin...	1	" "
Provincial Certificate.....	1	" "

Total..... 13

It is not necessary to pursue this classification further, as the examples which we have given sufficiently indicate the quality of the academic or literary training and teaching power which the

head masters of our best high schools and collegiate institutes possess. We think, too, that the test which has been applied by the first of these intermediate examinations was, in the main, and substantially, an impartial one. The next examination, held in December, was more perfect as to its details, but it did not, materially change the results of the first examination. The real significance and value of these examinations was, however, more distinctly brought out at the December one, which, for many reasons, took place in the same year as did the first. This we think was desirable. But we very much question the expediency or necessity of subjecting these schools to so severe a strain as these examinations involve, more than once a year. Two such examinations in the year would, as a rule, interfere with the proper routine and daily progress of the school, and subject it to the inevitable "cramming" process, which a test examination, like that of the "Intermediate," would be sure to promote.

From this digression we turn to the main subject of this paper. Before, however, discussing the mode of university consolidation which has been suggested, there are one or two preliminary questions to be considered, which incidentally affect the main one.

Suppose that every one, or a majority of the outlying universities chartered by the Legislature, were closed to-morrow, would that, it is fair to ask, prove a substantial gain to collegiate training and higher education in the Province? Would it be desirable to break up and disperse the knot of literary men, now found at the seat of these universities, devoted to the promotion of higher education? If not, then, in the interests of that higher education, we hold that these institutions should be efficiently maintained. Suppose also, on the same principle, that the instruction now given in one hundred high schools and collegiate institutes was in future to be given only in the eight or nine collegiate institutes now existing, or in a limited number of institutes placed in large and more convenient local centres. We think we have only to state these questions to practically answer them. Why, we would also ask, has it been found necessary to establish a second normal school at Ottawa, and project another at London? It may be answered that the Toronto school being full, it was found necessary to build another. Yes; but why not build it and all others as an enlargement of the existing one at Toronto—the head-quarters of the department, and under the very eye of

the Minister charged with the management of such institutions ? The answer is simple : the teachers of the eastern part of the Province did not, and would not come to Toronto—the mountain would not go to Mahomet ; Mahomet had, therefore, to go to the mountain. Hence the question had to be dealt with as a practical, not as a theoretical, one. Hence also, normal schools are, as a necessity, being established, and model schools projected in different parts of the Province—care being taken to subject the students of each to the same public examination. Under a common system of instruction and oversight. Every one concerned commends the wisdom of the course pursued.*

Even in Old England, with her intensely conservative Oxford and Cambridge, and in New England with her moderately conservative Harvard and Yale, the subject in the one case of "University Extension," and in the other of "University Cosmopolitanism" (if we may apply such a term to a university movement), has been variously discussed and practically illustrated. The tendency in both cases is tentatively in the same direction. The promoters seek to bring the college as near every man's door and circumstances as possible. They seek to modify its course and period of study so as to adapt it to the modern requirements of the various callings in life which require scholastic training and special knowledge.

Thus in England for instance, the first feeler in the direction which we have indicated was, to establish a system of local middle class examination,—to give a fixed value in the results, and then to bestow a special academic rank on the successful candidates. This system, as any one can see, is capable of indefinite extension and diffusion—and that extension and diffusion are only questions of time and experience.

Again, public discussions on the subject have indicated a strong

*Rev. Professor Seeley, in his essay on "*Liberal Education in Universities*," is strongly in favour of the multiplication of universities in England. He says, "Education in fact in England is what the [two] universities choose to make it. This seems to me too great a power to be possessed by two corporations, however venerable or illustrious. . . . I wish we had several more universities ; I mean teaching as well as examining universities. I hope that the scheme which was announced some time ago of creating a university for Manchester will not be allowed to sleep. I should like to see similar schemes started in three or four more centres of population and industry." He then asks this pertinent question, which might also be asked in Canada, "Is there anything more undeniable than that our material progress has outrun our intellectual, that we want more cultivation, more of the higher education, more ideas ?"—Pages 146, 147.

desire to convert university fellowships into college exhibitions, and abolish "compulsory residency within college walls." The Rev. Mark Pattison, B. D., Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, in his *Suggestions on Academical Organization*, discusses this matter at length; and in dealing with the question of "compulsory residence," says:—

"We are now back again, after fifteen years delay, face to face with the inevitable conclusion,—*compulsory* residence within college walls must cease to be the law of the university. So certain is it to come, that it is better to regard it already as a *fait accompli*, and to consider what the situation will carry with it." He further argues, "that permission to lodge out of town should not be fettered by any obligation to belong to a college."*

As to New England, the following remark by a writer in the *North America Review* for January, 1876, will best illustrate the university movements of the present day in the United States.

"One of the first innovations [on the typical American College, and its routine and discipline] was made when the University of Virginia allowed its scholars to elect their own courses, gave prominence to examinations, and laid no stress upon the system of four-year classes. Nearly half a century later, Cornell University sprung at once into great prominence by the freedom with which it threw off traditional fetters, allowing great freedom of choice of study, introducing abundant means of illustration and practical laboratories, engaging non-resident professors of distinction to supplement the ordinary teachers, and favouring technical instruction in the useful arts, as well as general instruction in the liberal arts. Yale College has . . . side by side successfully promoted in the Sheffield School, for a quarter of a century new courses of study in the modern sciences. Brown, Rutgers, Dartmouth, Princeton, and others of the older [Colonial] Colleges, maintain schools of science akin to the Sheffield School of Yale. But by far the boldest innovations which have been made in any American College, are those inaugurated at Harvard under the administration of President Eliot. The interior working of the institution has been remodelled, and great freedom of choice (extending to the modern departments of science, as well as to the

*In the Dublin University we believe it has long been the practice to admit outsiders to sizarships, scholarships, and degrees, on passing the prescribed examination. This has been a great boon to many students in Ireland who may not have much means.

various branches of literature, history and philosophy) is now permitted to every student with results, which appears to have dissipated nearly all doubts as to the wisdom of the plan, and to have attracted increasing numbers of students.

"These modifications" (the writer goes on to say) "of the American College are likely to be attended with the best results, for they accord with the best experience of other countries."—Pages 219, 220.

If such a scheme of "university extension," as we have indicated, is practicable, or desirable in England, there is no reason why it should not substantially and in effect be tested in Canada. And there can be no conclusive reason why there should not be scholarships provided by the Province open to the students of the various colleges which are gratuitously doing provincial work—especially when the value of such work can be tested by a provincial standard and by provincial authority. Why should not the Legislature, by a system of uniform examinations, as in the case of high schools and collegiate institutes, authorize a competition in the literary subjects of the arts course, to be open to all the colleges which are "doing the State good service;" and, if earned, let it be enjoyed by the successful candidates in their own colleges.

One of the hardest things which the outlying colleges have to submit to, in the doing of *bona fide* provincial university work (of which the country gratuitously reaps the benefit), is the present system of awarding scholarships. For the scholarships established by the University of Toronto no student of the outlying colleges can honourably compete, unless he turns his back upon his own university. It is, we submit, neither right nor fair to ask him to do so when, in the general competition, he comes up to the required standard demanded by the Province.

But if the Legislature would institute a number of additional scholarships to be competed for by the outlying colleges, as we have indicated, no jealousies could arise; and the Province could then recognise and equally reward these colleges for doing *bona fide* university work for the country.*

* Under no circumstances would it be desirable to touch one cent of the endowment of the Toronto University either for the purpose of securing "university consolidation" or for encouraging and rewarding those who perform approved university work in the outlying colleges. The Legislature should be disposed rather to recognise work done for the Province, and pay for it accordingly.

Now, looking at this matter in the light of our own experience, another equally practical question arises in dealing with this university consolidation question.

The Legislature, or rather the advisers of George III., provided means for the establishment of a central college and university at Toronto for the entire youth of the Province; and we have never outgrown that one idea of a single State college and university for the whole Province. The reason of this is, that we have assumed theoretically at least, that the youth of the country would not fail to come to Toronto. But our youth—many of them seeking college honours and university scholarships—have not, however, for the last twenty-five or thirty years, and will not (as in the case of the normal school), come to Toronto. Large numbers of them prefer to go to the outlying colleges, with university powers, in other parts of the country, while the Legislature, with abundant means at its disposal, has shown no disposition to establish or support more than the one teaching college originated by George III. for the whole Province, eighty or ninety years ago.

Probably this has arisen from the fact that no definite information in regard to the universities is available. The public are, therefore, at a loss to know what is the aggregate number of students which go to college, or what is the comparative number of matriculated students which have been yearly entered at the Universities of Toronto, Victoria, Queen's, Trinity, Albert, and others, or of the number which have graduated in the several faculties. The annual reports of University College, and of the University of Toronto, have not been published, and the calendars of the other colleges reach only a few individuals. The attention, therefore, of the Legislature, or of the public, has not been called to the subject, and no available information is at hand for their guidance. The Legislature is consequently ignorant of the facts of the case and the necessities of the Province in this matter, and has left these outlying and self-supporting colleges, to supply a pressing want which its own central institution does not meet. It may be asked: Was this the object which the Legislature had in view in recently multiplying universities with a free hand all over the country? We cannot say that it was not; and we do not like to say that it was done to promote political purposes; nor can we say that it was solely to gratify influential religious bodies. We must therefore take higher ground. We

must assume that grave public policy dictated that the Legislature should thus, without cost to itself, extend the sphere of collegiate training, localize facilities for it at various points in the Province, by placing the burthen on other shoulders than its own, and legalize, probably for wise, competitive purposes, institutions which, as rivals to each other, and to the Provincial one of Toronto, would together greatly promote, at a cheap rate to the State, the interests of sound training and higher education in the Province. This being the case, as we must assume from the facts just stated, the next question to be answered is: How shall these university privileges, thus diffused broadcast, be best combined so as to enable the country, with equal fairness to all, to apply to the results of local training a Provincial test, and to give to these results thus tested (if found satisfactory), a Provincial value? To answer this question in a satisfactory manner may be difficult, but we think it can be answered. To do so satisfactorily is to point out, we think, the only way in which the university privileges which the Province possesses, can be turned to the best practical account, and rendered subservient to the great purposes which the Legislature doubtless had in view in so largely multiplying, without charge to itself, our higher educational advantages.

As to the practicability of a satisfactory scheme of uniform examinations for all of the colleges, that question has been happily set at rest by actual experiment. In old England the uniform system of middle class as well as teachers' examinations has for some years been in successful operation. In Ontario the plan of an uniform examination for the high schools and the public school teachers respectively, has worked admirably. In the United

* The editor of the *Queen's College Journal* does not answer this question, but opposes "university consolidation" chiefly on the ground that "the inherent function of a university (adopting the *dictum* of Prof. Andrews), is to teach as well as examine," that it would be manifestly unfair to test the knowledge of students from different institutions, by a Board of Examiners unfamiliar with the method of teaching adopted at those colleges; and that "we would find ourselves reduced to a rigid inflexible system of text-books, with professors turned into mere teaching machines, a system which the writer thinks might "do in Normal and High Schools, etc."

Our answer is three-fold:—1st. The preponderance of feeling in England, as we have stated elsewhere, is in favour of "teaching colleges" in a university, but not necessarily a "teaching university." 2nd. In regard to the propriety of professors being examiners of their own students, we have fully answered that indefensible plea on page 21. 3rd. The objection that a comprehensive university system, would reduce colleges to a "rigid inflexible system," is fully answered elsewhere in this paper. Facts and experience paint the other way.

States, the Harvard College uniform entrance examinations, held simultaneously at Harvard College, at New York, and at Cincinnati, have, with the examples which we have quoted, proved beyond question the feasibility and economy of this mode of bringing to a common examination standard, the results of distant and varied training and preparation.

The idea of uniformity in university matriculation in Scotland has impressed itself forcibly on the mind of Sir Alexander Grant, the Principal of Edinburgh University. In his opening address on the 1st Nov., Sir Alexander said, that one of the "three great measures required for the improvement of the University of Edinburgh was a uniform matriculation examination for the universities of Scotland, imposed by ordinance."

There would be no difficulty in carrying out a uniform system of university examination in Ontario. Sealed envelopes, with prescribed examination papers enclosed, could be sent down to each college, which, at a given hour on a given day, and under proper supervision, could be opened and the papers placed before the candidates for degrees. The answers, when collected, could in like manner, be returned under seal to a Central Body at Toronto. Of course, such a body should be a representative one, in which each of the colleges would have confidence. The ceremony of conferring degrees could take place at each College under the local president, or in presence of some distinguished university officer appointed for that purpose.

For all practical purposes it is not a matter of prime necessity that all of the teaching colleges of a university should be together, or be of equal scholastic rank and standing. They are not so at Oxford and Cambridge. And it is amusing to see evidences of the jealousy which exists between the strong and the weak colleges at Oxford. Rev. Prof. Seeley, in his essay on a *Liberal Education in Universities*, says:

"Trinity College refuses to let the men of other colleges attend its good lectures, and the small colleges refuses to excuse its own students from attending its own inferior lectures."—Page 167.

It is necessary, however, that the college of a university should be good teaching colleges. It will be a sufficient guarantee to the country if the students who pass the final examination be found to give satisfactory evidence of educational training, and evince an acquaintance with certain prescribed subjects in the curriculum.

which would enable them to receive a degree, or provincial certificate of fitness for the grave duties of life.

Now comes the main question : Is it desirable, in the interests of higher education in this Province, that these certificates or diplomas, as evidences of scholastic training and literary culture, should issue from a high central authority alone, or from half a dozen different sources, having varying standards, and degrees of indeterminate values ? We think that all lovers of sound learning and excellence in scholarship will unhesitatingly answer the first part of this question in the affirmative, and negative the latter part. The further question then arises : How can this great university reform be accomplished at the least possible cost to this Province, and of injury to the existing institutions. There are three ways of doing it. (1.) The first and simplest, and yet the most unjust, would be for the Legislature, by the exercise of its sovereign power, to undo its own work and to abrogate the charters of all the rival colleges to the provincial university, and declare that from henceforth none of the colleges shall grant degrees but the central university at Toronto alone. This plan we dismiss, therefore, as unwise, unjust, and impracticable. (2.) A second mode of accomplishing the object aimed at might be to enter into negotiations with each of the outlying chartered universities to surrender, upon certain conditions, their university powers, and vest the sole authority to grant degrees in the central university of Toronto. (3.) The third and most feasible plan would be, to induce the various colleges to hold their charters granting university powers in abeyance, in consideration of the payment to them half-yearly of the interest on a capitalized sum, on certain conditions named hereafter, to be mutually agreed upon by the parties concerned, to be stopped, should the contract be broken, annulled or avoided by the colleges.*

As a preliminary, however, to the entertaining of such a proposition as the last, we hold it to be essential that, before the payment of any grant as an equivalent for the suspension by them of university powers, each of the colleges should be required to comply with certain conditions. These conditions should have

* We have purposely avoided entering into details as to the financial aspects of the question ; this not being the purpose of the paper. We would merely reiterate what we have said elsewhere, that not one cent of the endowment of Toronto University should be touched for any purpose but its own.

reference to the college buildings and their equipment, to the endowment raised and invested in good securities, and to the number of teachers and tutors which the college should be required to employ. The collegiate institutes are required, as a condition of recognition, and of receiving a special grant, to have suitable buildings and appurtenances; to teach the classics, and to employ at least four regular masters, besides having an average attendance of not less than sixty pupils, studying Greek and Latin. It would, therefore, be but just and reasonable to apply the same principle to the colleges on their becoming members of a central university, and receiving a grant from the Legislature.

It might be difficult to fix upon a basis satisfactory to all parties concerned, on which to make a capitalized grant to the outlying colleges. There are, however, three or four conditions which we would venture to suggest as essential in making these grants—

1. That no grant be made to a college the invested capital in good securities of which did not amount to at least \$50,000, independent of buildings and equipment.

2. That these securities should be lodged, either in the hands of the Government, as Trustees of the endowment, or in the hands of trustees named jointly by the College and the Government.

3. That any grant made by the Legislature should not be paid over to the College, but remain entirely in the hands of the Government as trustees of the fund.

4. That the interest on the Legislative Subsidy be paid to the College half-yearly, but that it be withheld, should the College resume its charter, or should the College not be kept up efficiently in the arts department, and in buildings and equipment, according to stipulations agreed to by the College and the Government, and ratified by the Legislative.

These conditions would ensure permanence and efficiency in the College, and would be ample security to the country, that the course of higher education would be strengthened and promoted.

In the exercise of its powers, the Legislature might, as a preliminary to making a grant, inquire into the quality, value, and substance of the education given in institutions which it has chartered, and to the scholastic diplomas, or degrees of which it has affixed a recognized and substantial value, by giving the holders of them a legal status as masters of high schools and collegiate institutes.

Should the question be raised as to the right of the Legislature to institute this inquiry, the answer is simple. It is inherent in the Legislature, in the interests of the public, to inquire under certain circumstances into the proceedings of any corporation which it has chartered—to see if the terms and conditions of the charter are observed. This is the more necessary when the acts of that corporation are recognized by the Legislature as conferring special rank, as well as certain legal rights and privileges, upon persons subject to its control and direction through the Minister of Education.

At this point the question might be asked: Why should the Legislature be called upon to make a grant to the colleges on condition that they suspend their functions, so far as the granting of degrees is concerned? It is right and proper to ask this question, as the answer to it involves the application to the case not only of a legal but of an equitable principle. To each of these colleges has been assigned, by the voluntary act of the Legislature, certain valuable rights, as well as a recognized legal status as training schools, or normal colleges, for high school masters. Relying on the good faith of the Legislature in granting these powers and privileges, and trusting to their permanency while exercised in the same good faith, these colleges have secured sites and erected buildings without charge to the public treasury. In agreeing to suspend their charters these colleges surrender substantial rights, and forego their legal status as universities. It does not require any demonstration to show that in doing these things each college not only voluntarily denudes itself of important and influential functions, but also surrenders a potent source of influence, as a public institution, among its own adherents or friends. To ask any corporation to thus voluntarily divest itself of its substantial character and functions, without some *quid pro quo*, would be unreasonable and unjust.

Of course, we know that each corporation concerned would not be disposed to estimate the value of what it surrenders, too lightly. A commission, or other impartial body could, therefore, be appointed to take all the circumstances of the case into consideration, and report accordingly. This we have no doubt the government would do impartially, should any project on the subject be entertained.

We have not touched upon a vital point which is involved in

this question : that of denominational *vs.* state, or so-called national colleges.* We think it beneath the dignity of the real question at issue to discuss this matter. It is invariably and unwarrantably assumed by the friends of state colleges that because a purely scientific and literary training, is received in a denominational college that, therefore, aid given to promote it involves "sectarian" endowment. This begging of the substantial question at issue is utterly unworthy of a writer with any pretensions to impartiality, or a desire, as a statesman, to deal partcally with a state of things which exists in every Christian country, and will always exist. No one will venture to say that the classics, mathematics, natural history or philosophy taught in these colleges are in any way tinged with a denominational shade or hue. No one has ever been able to detect the slightest leaning of the kind in the works of Newton or Laplace, or in those of the innumerable writers of standard text books. And this is all the public has to do with the matter.

Time and events have shown us for many years that, in this free country of ours, people will prefer sending their boys, at a critical and impressible age, to the care of persons in whose religious principles and faithful oversight they have confidence. Such people regard education without this influence and oversight dear at any price ; and if the education of their children could only be obtained without these safeguards, they would never permit them to receive it. They are not persons to be misled by the pretended analogy which is sometimes set up between the state grammar school and the state college. They know too well that the analogy does not exist—that, in the one case, their children are constantly under their own supervision at home, while, in the other case, they are without any kind of parental, or religious, or even anything more than a mere nominal moral oversight.

If the state could throw around the young neophyte the moral and religious safeguards of the ordinary christian HOME, the question as to a choice between the richly endowed state university and a semi-moderately equipped denominational one might be easily settled. But it does not, and cannot, from the very nature of the case.

* President Eliot, of Harvard University very aptly defines a State university to be "one managed directly by the State, and not through a close corporation provided for by the State." This distinction is very generally lost sight of ; the two are generally confounded.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that so large a proportion of those who have sons to educate, should deliberately pass by the rich university of the state, in favour of the scantily endowed and less attractive one of the denomination. We can anticipate the explanation which can be at once given to this apparent paradox: That religious fanaticism or prejudice will often lead a man to sacrifice the best interests of his child to some mistaken views of duty, of obligation, or of conscience.* This may be so in some instances, but not so in the generality of cases, with which we have to do in dealing with this question. A wise and sagacious statesman will look these things fairly in the face, will weigh the argument on both sides, and provide for the case accordingly.

However, we shall not pursue this matter further. Our purpose is, we think, a higher and better one: to consider how best to turn to real substantial profit to the country, our higher educational advantages as they exist, whether in the hands of denominations or of the state. Our plan would be to extract from the outlying and self-supporting colleges all that was really good in them, for the promotion of sound learning and literary culture, and to give to their degrees, or certificates of scholarship, a provincial, rather than a denominational and local value.

*The writer of the article on *State Universities* in the *North American Review* for October, 1875, argues against denominational, and in favour of state colleges. He admits that while the college is small, the supervision is satisfactory; but it partially ceases, except as an influence or tradition, when the college becomes large. He thinks the absence of it is more than made up in "a great university." For he holds that "the best education is an inspiration rather than an acquisition. It comes not simply from industry and steady habits, but far more largely from that kindling and glowing zeal, which is best begotten by familiar contact with boys, libraries, and museums, and enthusiastic specialists. . . . While the small college affords guidance and protection, the large one offers guidance, inspiration and opportunity."—Pages 370, 371. Not always; but even if it did, this is not all that a college should do with impressive young men, placed under its care at a very critical age.

The editor of a leading American Educational Journal, in a recent article says:—"By far the larger part of those who support and patronize our colleges are *Christian* men. In the minds of these men, educational and religious ideas are indissolubly wedded. A purely secularized education they do not want, and will not have. The very principle of loyalty to their religious convictions holds them loyal to these Christian colleges. These men do indeed see the grand mission of the more completely secularized State institutions; but they see also other interests which these institutions cannot subserve. They are the interests of characteristically Christian education. And who shall tell what our country owes to this style of education? What does it owe on the score of men whom it has trained and given to the country? What on the score of the type of civilization, it has developed? What, for the political and educational systems it has created and fostered?"

We must take things as they are ; and we should accept the educational situation in this matter. We cannot extinguish the out-lying colleges. They will not die, as was prophesied and thought possible when the legislative grant was taken from them. It would be a calamity if they were extinguished, for they are sources and centres of intellectual light all over the Province. They are, moreover, doing the state noble service, faithfully and efficiently, according to their ability, and for which the state pays nothing. So far, therefore, as they are disposed to promote the great object of our system of public instruction, we should accept their assistance and seek to give a national direction and value to their labours in the common work of uplifting our country to a high state of intellectual culture, refinement, and intelligence.

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED
DATE 11-10-2001 BY 60321 UCBAW

THE
JOURNAL
OF
THE
ROYAL
ANTHROPOLOGICAL
INSTITUTE
OF GREAT
BRITAIN
AND IRELAND
VOLUME
LXXV
PART I
1905

TREVELYAN, (G. O.)—The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay, by his Nephew, G. OTTO TREVELYAN, M.P. With Portrait on Steel. Complete in 2 vols. 8vo., Cloth, \$3.00 ; Half Calf, \$5.00 ; Full Morocco, \$8.00.

"Mr. Trevelyan has written the memoir of his uncle with as much good taste as grateful and affectionate feeling. * * * Mr. Trevelyan has chiefly relied on copious selections from a mass of the most unreserved family correspondence ; for from his boyhood to the latest days of his career Macaulay lived with his sisters on terms of the most loving intimacy, making them the confidants of all his hopes and feelings. His letters to lady Trevelyan and others, while they bubble over with *verve* and playfulness, resemble rather those private journals which some men keep for their own satisfaction, but scrupulously reserve for personal reading. They make us intimately acquainted with the great author and statesman. We are presented to a man of most affectionate and lovable nature, with the gift of inspiring intense attachment and admiration in those who were the nearest and dearest to him."—*London Times*.

"The correspondence which fills so large a space is remarkable for its naturalness and freedom, written without the slightest aim at literary effect, and relating the current events of the day with the frankness and hilarity of a roystering school-boy. Macaulay's warm domestic affections crop out on every occasion, and the whole tone of the letters indicates a man of unaffected simplicity of character and true nobleness of purpose. His sketches of the literary society of London, of which he was not to 'the manner born,' will charm many readers who retain a taste for personal gossip about famous writers."—*N. Y. Tribune*.

"We do not doubt that these volumes will be read throughout the world with a curiosity and an interest only to be surpassed by the success of Lord Macaulay's own writings."—*Edinburgh Review*.

"Mr. Trevelyan has produced, from very rich and attractive materials, a very delightful book."—*Spectator*, London.

"A delightful surprise even to the most insatiable devourer of biographies. * * * Sure to be a classic among biographies."—*N. Y. Times*.

"It is rarely that a biography of a man of letters, a poet and a statesman, a man of the world and a retired student, a favourite in society and a lover of home, can be otherwise than interesting. It would be difficult to find one half so full of interest in its details, and narrated so simply, eloquently, and judiciously, as this *Life of Macaulay* by his nephew. * * * There is not merely not one page that is dull, but there is not a page which has not some variety of charm to attract and absorb the delighted reader."—*Notes and Queries*, London.

"The biography is in every respect worthy of the subject. Mr. Trevelyan has executed his task with most praiseworthy modesty and good taste, and with great literary skill. * * * Macaulay's life forms a most interesting book, living as he did in the thick of the literary and political activity of his time. It affords us many fresh pictures of incidents in which he played a part, and amusing and instructive anecdotes of the celebrities with whom he came in contact, and above all, it throws a great deal of unexpected light on his own personal character."—*Examiner*, London.

"In the pages of Mr. Trevelyan, readers will find that which ought to be studied and can hardly be abridged."—GLADSTONE in the *Quarterly Review*.

"There has not been so good a biography since Stanley's Arnold."—*Westminster Review*.

"The biographies of three men, Samuel Johnson, 1709-1784 (Boswell) ; Walter Scott, 1771-1832 (Lockart) ; and Thomas Babington Macaulay, 1800-1859 (Trevelyan), cover one hundred and fifty years of the literary history of England, and are probably the best works of their class written."—*Am. Bibliopolist*.

BELFORD'S

Monthly Magazine,

ILLUSTRATED.

Published by BELFORD BROS.. at 11 Colborne Street, Toronto.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$3.00.

SINGLE COPIES, 30 CTS.

Read what the Press says of the first number :—

“ It has been looked for with interest, and we venture to express the belief that public expectation will not be disappointed. They have started well, and they will continue as they have begun, we do not doubt.”—*Toronto Mail*.

“ To judge from its literary character and mechanical execution, it will stand an equal chance with other candidates for public favour.”—*Toronto Globe*.

“ The array of names, as contributors to this promising repertory, is certainly both varied and attractive in the extreme. The printing, paper, and general appearance are highly creditable to the publishers.”—*Quebec Chronicle*.

“ Every lover of literature in Canada should subscribe to this magazine.”—*Goderich Huron Signal*.

“ It is printed in the highest style of the art, elegantly illustrated, and is without doubt our best Canadian publication.”—*Markham Economist*.

“ The whole number, containing 136 pages, is excellent, and, we repeat, creditable to the publishers.”—*Whitby Chronicle*.

“ Will bear favourable comparison with the general run of similar publications in the old world.”—*St. Thomas Weekly Times*.

“ One feature of this truly excellent magazine we must not omit to mention, and that is, its illustrations, which are faultless—more cannot be said. We hope and believe (not alone because it is a Canadian enterprise) that the magazine will have unbounded success.”—*Windsor Evening Times*

“ The new magazine deserves the support of the reading public of the Dominion.”—*Galt Reformer*.

“ Is unquestionably the most ambitious effort yet made in this country in the magazine line.”—*St. Thomas Home Journal*.

“ The contents are varied, interesting and instructive, and the magazine is gotten up in excellent style, as regards paper, printing and illustrations.”—*Collingwood Bulletin*.

“ The entire publication, in short, reflects credit on the judgment and good sense of the proprietors, and we predict for it an extensive sale.”—*St. Catharines Journal*.

